



Merseyside Sports Partnership Advisory Board

MEETING DATE / HOST VENUE	Monday 8 th February 2016- Partnership For Learning, Training & Conference Centre, South Road, Speke, Liverpool, L24 9PZ
NOTE TAKER	Bronagh McAllister
ATTENDEES	Cameron Jones (Chair); Jean Stephens (Director); Brian Boyle (Voluntary Sport Sector Expert); David Boocock (Local Government Expert); Suzanne Ramsey (School Sport Expert) SGO's); Sion Williams (SW) (Marketing Expert); Tom Smith (Sport Expert); Mark Coups (Sport Expert); Kerry Stewart (Strategic Lead for Business Improvement), Cllr Wendy Simons (Political Expert); Sue Wilkinson (SWilk) (Physical Education Expert)
APOLOGIES	Elizabeth Farrington (Public Health England Expert); Ron Odunaiya (Local Government Expert – Host Authority)
DISTRIBUTION	www.merseysidesport.com , Core Team Development Managers

AGENDA ITEM 1

TITLE: WELCOME, APOLOGIES AND INTRODUCTIONS

DISCUSSION	OUTCOME / ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE
CJ welcomed everyone to the Board Induction MSP Advisory Board members (BM) introduced themselves to the group	A. Apologies were given for RO and LF		

AGENDA ITEM 2

TITLE: SETTING THE SCENE/ MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETING NOT ON THE AGENDA

DISCUSSION	OUTCOME / ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE
CJ since the first Board meeting had met with MSP / JS on a number of occasions. They have been looking at; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data and information (information provided in advance) • Content of MSP • Deliveries of MSP • Ways of working CJ encouraged BM to make contact with the MSP team and arrange to mentor members of MSP team	A. Action notes agreed as a true record from previous meeting of the 4th December 2014 B. An exercise to identify needs of MSP team members, matched with skills & experience of board members needs to take place to create value added mentoring.	ALL JS	MAR 2016 APRIL 2016

AGENDA ITEM 3

TITLE: HORIZON SCANNING

DISCUSSION	OUTCOME /ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE
<p>At the last meeting BM were asked to feedback to MSP on the 3 Big things in your industry. Feedback from BM is attached to the MSP Board pack. CJ invited members to feedback key points that could represent an opportunity (O) or a threat (T), these included :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring of MSP efficiency (O/T) Identify and focus on key performance indicators (KPIs) and use resources to focus on the delivery (O) Keeping the customer informed/ testimonials is a key piece for the business to move forward. There should be a review after each project/ event. (O/T) Creation of digital/ non digital world, this can be seen as an opportunity but also a threat due to size of the team Health & children in school, this is an opportunity but also a threat as we can't solve all children's health. (O) An opportunity in workforce as companies will move to prevention and get employees healthier. Health = Nutrition & Activity (O) Change in reduction in budgets in local authorities, the ability for LA's to deliver will change e.g. access to facilities may change or close and will have an effect on sport & physical activity. A potential for businesses/ retailers to take over the facilities, this could be an opportunity for MSP in seeking new funding. (T/O) Liverpool devolution agreement (O) <p>Further healthy discussions took place around:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traditional team sports V groups of individual doing sports & physical activity (O) Impact of social media – creating self generated, self sufficient activities for large groups of individuals relevant to their motivations and life choices .EG “Road to Rio” workplace challenge (O) Recruiting volunteers into workforce for individual groups as the trend is to recruit the volunteer to join a sports group. Change in the digital world will explode. Robust data – concerns flagged <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is our data robust enough? For all ages of our population? Do we have any data missing to make informed business decisions? IE Under 16's Understanding the behaviours and motivations to why people participate or not is the crucial Are we really capturing physical activities levels? EG people walking to work – should we? Can we? 	<p>a. Using Merseyside Active People data for the past 3 years to plot levels of participation V sport/activity to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess confidence levels Identify gaps in data Identify possible solutions <p>b. Using Merseyside Active People data for the past 10 years (Sport) and 2 years (physical activity) plot trends in participation rates – Merseyside wide and per local area.</p>	MSP	MARCH 2016

AGENDA ITEM 4

TITLE: PROGRESS ON ACTIONS- ITEM 2 OF ACTION NOTES

DISCUSSION	OUTCOME /ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE
<p>1. Mission, Vision and modelling (ways of working) was shared to BM by JS.</p> <p>2. Areas highlight included:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis using Active People 9 data accompanied with key health statistics were provided in advance of the board meeting. The data provided some good insight in terms of key focus areas (pages 19-20) that required further exploring IE under 5's, gender in balance amongst segments of the inactive population The data also showed the participation differences between sport and physical activity, however, the 55-64 years showed no difference whether doing no sport or inactive. <p>3. Mission “Working together to improve the quality of life for the People of Merseyside through Sport & Physical Activity”</p>	<p>a. Investment per person analysis for Merseyside. – Using available financial data and information -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lottery investment 2009-2015 Exchequer investment 2009-2015 Local Authority via freedom of information request Mid range population census Compare with nearest MSP neighbours <p>b. Cost (finance) V Resources (capacity) = size of Impact (participants) by Using MSP financial, data and information for 3 years</p> <p>c. Priority segments of Merseyside population require a in-depth discussion and agreement</p> <p>d. BM agreed Mission without “Merseyside” and add “all people” or “everyone”</p>	<p>KS/DB</p> <p>KS/JS</p> <p>BM</p>	<p>MARCH 2016</p> <p>MARCH 2016</p> <p>MARCH / APRIL 2016</p>

<p>4. Vision by 2022 (what we want to achieve)- options shortlisted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Motivating everyone to embrace an active lifestyle” • “Inspiring everyone to be active everyday” • “being active is a way of life” <p>The following observations were cited from the vision discussion:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are at a crossroad due to the region moving from Merseyside to Liverpool City, this may affect the wording of MSP Mission • We need to consider the language we use, if this was a behavioural issue, this could be seen as negative. We want to be seen to help people achieve their aim. <p>5 Physical Activity & Sport Model (ways of working)</p> <p>The principles of the model was shared and positively received by BM – see diagram below</p> <p>6 MSP stakeholder analysis</p> <p>JS gave an overview of the process her team have undertaken analysis who are MSP stakeholders and why. Presented was a summary of the analysis based on Investment V Alignment of mission. It was highlighted that as this present time:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SE are MSP only financial stakeholder • LCC is MSP host and contribute financial support in terms HR & finance • Stretched with the number of partners • Arrows indicating desired position of stakeholder <p>JS went through the jobs that MSP need to do between now and April 2016 – see re worked jobs in action notes</p>	<p>e. Language to be shaped and sharpened before sharing with BM for consideration</p> <p>f. Shaping and sharpening language in the model</p> <p>g. Build the tasks / contents at each of the stages of the model – add what does MSP do and what do partners do? Purpose to identify the gaps, duplication and value added. * it is noted this is a large exercise given the scale of the sector</p> <p>h. Further work required on stakeholder analysis:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantify X angle in finance • Realistic movement of stakeholders • Separate “cash” and “non-cash” enablers • Document to remain internal only 	<p>SW/JS/ HB</p> <p>SW/JS/ HB</p> <p>JS/ TS/LF</p> <p>JS/WS</p>	<p>MARCH 2016</p> <p>MARCH 2016</p> <p>APRIL 2016</p> <p>APRIL 2016</p>
---	---	---	---

AGENDA ITEM 5

TITLE: GENERAL FEEDBACK/ AOB

DISCUSSION	OUTCOME /ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE
<p>CJ would like the BM to advise how they would like the agenda to flow?</p> <p>SWilk said she has sat on many Boards but finds this meeting productive. DB agrees it is refreshing.</p> <p>BB would like to see the Board have a financial breakdown, in the pack we have 2016/17 financial obligations; however it would be good practice for the Board to have a brief financial expenditure.</p> <p>CJ when the Board settles we should look into inviting businesses to the meeting to help stimulate our thinking</p>	<p>a. Agreed on a financial update</p> <p>b. Focus on two items max per meeting</p> <p>c. Outcomes focus – clarity of actions required</p>		